arXiv:1110.3517v1 [math.CA] 16 Oct 2011

ON THE BOUNDEDNESS OF THE BILINEAR HILBERT TRANSFORM ALONG “NON-FLAT” SMOOTH CURVES

VICTOR LIE

Abstract. We are proving $L^2(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}) \to L^1(\mathbb{R})$ bounds for the bilinear Hilbert transform H_Γ along curves $\Gamma = (t, -\gamma(t))$ with γ being a smooth “non-flat” curve near zero and infinity.

1. **Introduction**

The result that we present here treats the problem of providing $L^2(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}) \to L^1(\mathbb{R})$ bounds for the bilinear Hilbert transform H_Γ along curves $\Gamma = (t, -\gamma(t))$ defined by

$$H_\Gamma : S(\mathbb{R}) \times S(\mathbb{R}) \longmapsto S'(\mathbb{R})$$

$$H_\Gamma(f,g)(x) := \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x-t) g(x+\gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} \,,$$

where, heuristically, γ is a locally differentiable function which is “non-flat” (or equivalently, not “resembling” a line) near the origin and near the infinity. For the precise statement of the result one should see the next section.

Li ([11]) was the first to address this topic in the particular case when the curve is given by a monomial $\gamma(t) = t^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$ $(d \geq 2)$. In this paper we improve his result both quantitatively, by obtaining a better decay and qualitatively, by extending the class of functions for which the main theorem holds. Also, our proof relies on different techniques and does not involve the notion of $\sigma-$uniformity used in the monomial case (for an antithesis between the two approaches one should see the first subsection of the Appendix). Instead, and this constitutes the novelty in this paper, we will use a discretization procedure of our operator which simultaneously realizes the following: on one hand separates the variables on the frequency side, on the other hand it preservers the main characteristics (high oscillation and smoothness in one of the variables) of the phase function of the multiplier. This discretization realizes the subtle equilibrium between the two possible extremes: cutting too rough the multiplier (or not at all) which runs into the difficulty of taking advantage of the cancelation offered by the phase (this is

---

Date: October 18, 2011.

one of the reasons for which Li's argument required the subtle concept of σ uniformity) or the other scenario of a very fine discretization which comes, among others, with delicate number theoretical problems involving Van der Corput lemma and Weil type sums (also see the second subsection of the Appendix). Another interesting aspect of our proof relies on the class of curves γ for which our main theorem holds (see (2), (3) and (4)). The conditions imposed on our curves (especially (2) and (3)) appear as natural but do not seem to have a direct correspondent in the previous math literature.

The fundamental concept that comes in the proof of our result is that of *curvature*. It will be responsible for both the strategy chosen to discretize the multiplier of our operator and for the "scale-type decay"[1] that we will be able to obtain for summing up all the discretized pieces.

This curvature concept proves essential in a series of problems in analysis of which, possibly the most prominent example is offered by the Restriction Problem ([14]). Several of these problems are described in the nice survey paper of Stein and Wainger ([15]). In particular, they mention there one classical problem close in spirit to ours, namely the study of the boundedness properties of the Hilbert transform along curves $\Gamma:\ \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}^n$, $(n\geq 1)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_\Gamma:\ S(\mathbb{R}^n)\ \to\ S'(\mathbb{R}^n)$$
$$\mathcal{H}_\Gamma(f)(x):=p.v.\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x-\Gamma(t))\,\frac{dt}{t}\,.$$

This topic, as described in [15], was initiated by Jones ([9]) and Fabes and Riviere ([5]) for studying the behavior of the constant coefficient parabolic differential operators. Later it was extended to more general classes of curves ([15], [4]) and to the setting of homogeneous nilpotent Lie groups ([1], [2]).

In a different direction, (see also [11]), our problem does present some parallelism with the problem of the (L^2-)norm-convergence of the nonconventional bilinear averages

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} f(T^n)\,g(T^{n^2})$$

as N tends to infinity. Here T is an invertible and measure-preserving transformation of a finite measure space $(X,\mathcal{F},\mu)$ and $f,g\in L^2(X,\mathcal{F},\mu)$.

As it stands, this topic was treated by Furtstenberg in [6], and later generalized to powers represented by polynomials (see e.g. [8]).

However, because of the unsatisfactory transference principle from the discrete to the continuous setting it does not seem that one can establish a clear connection between our problem and the corresponding ergodic-theoretical one.

Finally, the study of the boundedness of the bilinear Hilbert transform along curves can be regarded as a natural extension of the work of M. Lacey and C. Thiele on the resolution of Calderon conjecture ([12], [13]).

---

[1] Determined by the level sets of the phase function.

Indeed, their situation represents the case of the infinitely *flat* curve $\gamma(t) = t$, the absence of the curvature increasing the difficulty level of the proof. For more details as well as other comments relating our problem the reader should consult the Remarks section.

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank Xiaochun Li and Christoph Thiele for reading the manuscript and providing useful observations.

2. **Main Result**

More precisely, let us define $\mathcal{NF}_0$ - the class of smooth non-flat functions near the origin where by definition $\gamma \in \mathcal{NF}_0$ iff γ has the following properties:

- *smoothness, variation*

  $\exists\, \delta > 0$ (possibly depending on γ) such that $\gamma \in C^N(\mathcal{V}_\delta)$ $(N \geq 4)$ and $|\gamma'| > 0$ on $\mathcal{V}_\delta := (-\delta, \delta) \setminus \{0\}$; moreover

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+} \#\{j \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \,|\, |2^{-j}\,\gamma'(2^{-j})| \in [\alpha, 2\alpha]\} < \infty\,. \tag{1}$$

- *asymptotic behavior*

  If $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\{a_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\lim_{j\to\infty} a_j = 0$ such that:

  For any $t \in I := \{s \,|\, \frac{1}{4} \leq |s| \leq 4\}$ we have

$$\frac{\gamma(2^{-j}\,t)}{2^{-j}\,\gamma'(2^{-j})} = Q(t) \,+\, Q_j(t) \tag{2}$$

  with Q, $Q_j \in C^N(I)$ and $\|Q_j\|_{C^N(I)} \leq a_j$.

  For $s \in J = (Q' + Q_j')(I)$ we require

$$\frac{(\gamma')^{-1}(s\,\gamma'(2^{-j}))}{(\gamma')^{-1}(\gamma'(2^{-j}))} = r(s) \,+\, r_j(s)\,, \tag{3}$$

  where r, $r_j \in C^{N-1}(J)$ with $\|r_j\|_{C^{N-1}(J)} \leq a_j$.

  (The existence of $(\gamma')^{-1}$, the inverse of γ', will be a consequence of the next hypothesis.)

- *non-flatness*

  The main terms in the asymptotic expansion obey

$$\inf_{t\in I} |Q''(t)|,\ \inf_{t\in J} |r'(t)| > c_\gamma > 0\,, \tag{4}$$

  and

$$\inf_{\substack{t_1,\, t_2 \in J\\ t_1 \neq t_2}} \frac{|t_1\, r'(t_1) - t_2\, r'(t_2)|}{|t_1 - t_2|} > c_\gamma\,. \tag{5}$$

In a similar fashion (with the obvious changes) we define $\mathcal{NF}_\infty$ - the class of smooth non-flat functions near the infinity.

Finally set

$$\mathcal{NF} := C(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \cap \mathcal{NF}_0 \cap \mathcal{NF}_\infty$$

and $\mathcal{NF}^C := \mathcal{NF} \,+\, \mathit{Constant}$.

The central result in this paper is given by

Main Theorem. *Let* $\Gamma = (t, -\gamma(t))$ *be a curve such that* $\gamma \in \mathcal{NF}^C$*. Define the bilinear Hilbert transform* H_Γ *along the curve* Γ *as*

$$H_\Gamma : S(\mathbb{R}) \times S(\mathbb{R}) \longmapsto S'(\mathbb{R})$$

$$H_\Gamma(f, g)(x) := p.v. \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x-t)g(x+\gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t} \, .$$

Then H_Γ *extends boundedly from* $L^2(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ *to* $L^1(\mathbb{R})$*.*

Observations.

1) Any real polynomial of degree strictly grater than one belongs to the class $\mathcal{NF}_\infty$ and any real polynomial with no constant and no linear term belongs to $\mathcal{NF}_0$.

2) If γ is a real analytic function near 0 (or ∞) such that $\gamma(0) = \gamma'(0) = 0$ (or $\gamma(\infty) = \gamma'(\infty) = 0$) then it belongs to $\mathcal{NF}_0$ ($\mathcal{NF}_\infty$).

3) Any (real) Laurent polynomial $P(t) = \sum_{j=-n}^{m} a_j \, t^j$ with $\{a_j\}_j \subset \mathbb{R}$, a_{-n}, $a_m \neq 0$ and $n, m \geq 2$ belongs to $\mathcal{NF}$.

4) Any expression (linear combination of terms) of the form $|t|^\alpha \, (\log |t|)^\beta$ with α, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \notin \{0, \, 1\}$ is in $\mathcal{NF}$.

5) Notice that $Q' : \, I \mapsto Q'(I)$ and $r : \, Q'(I) \mapsto I$ are inverse one to the other and of class C^{N-1}.

6) Essentially the fact that $\gamma \in \mathcal{NF}$ implies on one hand that γ' is slowly varying and on the other hand the existence of $V(0)$ - a neighborhood of 0 (and respectively infinity - $V(\infty)$) such that $|\gamma'(\cdot)| > 0$ on $V(0) \setminus \{0\}$ (and correspondingly on $V(\infty)$) and

$$\inf_{t \in V(0) \setminus \{0\}} \left| \frac{t \, \gamma''(t)}{\gamma'(t)} \right| > c_\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{t \in V(\infty)} \left| \frac{t \, \gamma''(t)}{\gamma'(t)} \right| > c_\gamma \, . \tag{6}$$

7) As a consequence of the above observation we have that $\gamma \in \mathcal{NF}$ requires the existence of two constants K, $C > 0$ such that

- when $|t| \to 0$ either $|\gamma'(t)| < K \, |t|^C$ or $|\gamma'(t)| > \frac{K}{|t|^C}$;
- when $|t| \to \infty$ either $|\gamma'(t)| > K \, |t|^C$ or $|\gamma'(t)| < \frac{K}{|t|^C}$.

For further discussions see the remarks section.

Finally, it is worth noticing, that from the work in [13] we know that if

$$\gamma(t) = \alpha \, t$$

satisfies the non-degeneracy condition

$$\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-1\}$$

then H_Γ is a bounded operator from $L^2(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ to $L^1(\mathbb{R})$.

If we add at this result the implications of our Main Theorem together with the second observation we have the following:

Corollary. *Let $\gamma \in C(\mathbb{T})$ be a real function which is real analytic in the origin and such that*

$$\gamma(t) \sim \sum_{k\in N} c_k\, t^k \quad when\, |t| \to 0, \quad c_1 \neq -1\, .$$

Then the bilinear Hilbert transform on the torus $H_{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{T}}$ along the curve $\Gamma = (t, -\gamma(t))$ given by

$$H_{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{T}}(f,g)(x) := p.v. \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(x-t) g(x+\gamma(t)) \frac{dt}{t}$$

becomes a bounded operator from $L^2(\mathbb{T}) \times L^2(\mathbb{T})$ to $L^1(\mathbb{T})$.

3. **The analysis of the multiplier**

If viewed in a multiplier setting, we have:

$$H_{\Gamma}(f,g)(x) := \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(\xi) \hat{g}(\eta) m(\xi,\eta) e^{i\xi x} e^{i\eta x} d\xi d\eta\, .$$

where

$$m(\xi,\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\xi t}\, e^{i\eta\gamma(t)}\, \frac{dt}{t}\, .$$

As usual we start by decomposing the kernel $\frac{1}{t}$ as follows:

$$\frac{1}{t} = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \rho_j(t) \qquad \forall\ t \in \mathbb{R}^*\, ,$$

where ρ is an odd C^∞ function with supp $\rho \subseteq \left\{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid \frac{1}{4} < |t| < 1\right\}$ and $\rho_j(t) := 2^j \rho(2^j t)$ (with $j \in \mathbb{Z}$).

Consequently,

$$m(\xi,\eta) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} m_j(\xi,\eta)$$

with

$$m_j(\xi,\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\xi t}\, e^{i\eta\gamma(t)}\, \rho_j(t) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\,\frac{\xi}{2^j}\,t}\, e^{i\,\eta\gamma(\frac{t}{2^j})}\, \rho(t)\, dt\, . \tag{7}$$

As one may expect, from the above chain of equalities, we need to understand the behavior of m_j when $|j| \to \infty$ which further involves the properties of γ near the origin and infinity. We expect though that the essential role should be played by the curvature condition (4) imposed to the curve γ.

As an exemplification for the use of the curvature condition in deriving asymptotic behavior let us remind the following classical result (see [14]):

Proposition (model - curvature/asymptotic behavior).
Let $\omega \in C^2((-\delta+p, \delta+p))$ with $\delta, p \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta > 0$ and suppose that $\omega'(p) = 0$ but $\omega''(p) \neq 0$. Then if $\lambda > 0$ and $a \in C^\infty((-\delta+p, \delta+p))$ is

supported in a sufficiently small neighborhood of p *we have that*

$$(8)\qquad \int_R e^{-\pi\, i\, \lambda\, \omega(x)}\, a(x)\, dx = c\, e^{-\pi\, i\, \lambda\, \omega(p)}\, \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\, |\omega''(p)|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\, a(p) + O(\lambda^{-\frac{3}{2}})\, .$$

Another instance, of similar flavor, where the curvature condition plays an important role is the following formulation (see e.g. [14]) for the asymptotic of the Fourier transform of $e^{i\Phi(t)}$ where here $\Phi(t)$ is a C^1-function which, say for $t > 1$, is strictly convex and obeys $\lim_{t\rightarrow\infty}\Phi'(t) = +\infty$:

$$(9)\qquad \int_1^\infty e^{-i\xi t}\, e^{i\Phi(t)} a(t) dt \approx c\, e^{-i\Psi(\xi)}\, \Phi''(\Psi'(\xi))^{-1/2}\, a(\Psi'(\xi))\, ,$$

in the sense that the quotient of both sides tends as 1 as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$.

Here $\Psi(\xi) := \sup_t(t\xi - \Phi(t))$ is the 'dual phase'[2] of Φ, c is an absolute constant, while a is some "well behaved" smooth function.

Inspired by (8) and (9), our intention is to show that in the setting $\Phi_\eta(t) = \eta\,\gamma(t)$ and Ψ_η given by $\Psi'_\eta(\cdot) = (\eta\,\gamma')^{-1}(\cdot)$, for $|\Phi_\eta(\cdot)|$ large enough, our symbol m_j has the form:

$$(10)\qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\,\xi\, t}\, e^{i\,\eta\gamma(t)}\, \rho_j(t)\, dt = \, c\, e^{-i\Psi_\eta(\xi)}\, (\Psi''_\eta(\xi))^{1/2}\, 2^j\, \rho^*\left(2^j\, (\gamma')^{-1}(\frac{\xi}{\eta})\right) \,+\, \mathrm{Er}\, .$$

where here the error term obeys

$$\mathrm{Er} = o((\Psi''_\eta(\xi))^{1/2})\ ,$$

and ρ^* is a smooth function, with $\rho^* \in C^N(\mathbb{R})$ and $\operatorname{supp}\rho^* \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\rho$.

Relations (8) and (9) are an expression of the *stationary phase principle* which loosely asserts that the main contribution for an oscillatory expression comes from the information concentrated into the neighborhoods of the stationary points.

Following this, when studying our multiplier

$$m_j(\xi,\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\,\frac{\xi}{2^j}\,t}\, e^{i\,\eta\gamma(\frac{t}{2^j})}\, \rho(t)\, dt\ ,$$

we first need to understand the stationary point(s) of the phase function. Thus we are led to the study of the equations of the form $\frac{\xi}{2^j} - \frac{\eta}{2^j}\,\gamma'(\frac{t}{2^j}) = 0$ when $|j|$ large and $t \in \operatorname{supp}\rho$. Now, based on the property (2), (with the obvious correspondent near infinity) we have that γ' is *slowly varying* near zero and infinity. These facts suggest the further analysis of m_j relative to the size of the terms $\frac{\xi}{2^j}$ and $\frac{\eta}{2^j}\,\gamma'(\stackrel{+}{-}2^{-j})$.

Based on the above analysis we are invited to split m_j as follows:

---

[2] From the definition one notices that Ψ' and Φ' are inverses of each other. The concept of duality of phases can be extended to pair of functions that are complementary in the sense of Young's inequality (see [14], [16]).

Let ν_0, ν_1, ν_2 be (even) positive smooth functions such that $\nu_0 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\operatorname{supp} \nu_0 \subset (-9/10, 9/10)$, $\nu_1 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\operatorname{supp} \nu_1 \subset \{x \mid \frac{1}{2} < |x| < 2\}$, $\nu_2 \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $\operatorname{supp} \nu_2 \subset \{x \mid |x| > 3/2\}$ and

$$\nu_0 + \nu_1 + \nu_2 = 1 .$$

Set now $\nu_{j,k}(x) := \nu_k(2^{-j}x)$ and $\nu_{\gamma,j,k}(x) := \nu_k(2^{-j}\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\,x)$, $k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$.

Then, each component m_j of the multiplier m is expressed as:

$$m_j = \sum_{k,l=0}^{2} m_j^{kl}$$

where

$$m_j^{kl}(\xi, \eta) := m_j(\xi, \eta)\, \nu_{j,k}(\xi)\, \nu_{\gamma,j,l}(\eta) .$$

This last relation can be written in a more explicit form:

$$m_j^{kl}(\xi, \eta) = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\,\frac{\xi}{2^j}\,t}\, e^{i\,\eta\,\gamma(\frac{t}{2^j})}\, \rho(t)\, dt \right) \nu_k(\frac{\xi}{2^j})\, \nu_l(2^{-j}\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\,\eta) . \tag{11}$$

Taking advantage of the mean zero property[3] of the function ρ together with (1) and (2) one notices that for $k, l \in \{0, 1\}$ each

$$m_{kl} = \sum_j m_j^{kl}$$

is a Hörmander-Mikhlin multiplier and hence the Coifman-Meyer Theorem applies.

Alternatively one can use Taylor expansions, (1), (2) and show that all the symbols m_j^{kl} with $k, l \in \{0, 1\}$ can be essentially reduced[4] to the study of the symbols having the form

$$u_j(\xi, \eta) := \psi(\xi\, 2^{-j})\, \varphi(\eta\, 2^{-j}\, \gamma'(2^{-j})) ,$$

where ψ, η are smooth compactly supported functions and at least one of them has a zero at the origin (i.e. $\psi(0) = 0$ or $\varphi(0) = 0$).

Now taking $u = \sum_j u_j$ and defining

$$\mathcal{V}(f, g)(x) := \text{p.v.} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(\xi) \hat{g}(\eta) u(\xi, \eta) e^{i\xi x} e^{i\eta x} d\xi d\eta ,$$

one may apply the classical paraproduct theory for concluding the following:

Theorem 1. *For any* $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{r}$ *with* $p, q > 1$ *and* $r > \frac{1}{2}$ *we have*

$$\|\mathcal{V}(f, g)\|_r \lesssim_{\gamma,p,q,r} \|f\|_p\, \|g\|_q .$$

---

[3] This the *only* but *key* point where we are using the cancelation of the kernel $\frac{1}{t}$ and hence the mean zero of ρ.

[4] As linear combination of u_j 's with l^1-summable coefficients.

Thus, Theorem 1 solves our concerns relative to the boundedness properties of the operators given by the symbols m_{kl} when $k, l \in \{0,1\}$.

The cases when $|k-l| \geq 1$ and $k=2$ or $l=2$ follow the same lines with the extra twist that here we will use the decay obtained from applying the nonstationary phase method (indeed in this case the phase function present in our symbol is highly oscillatory and has no stationary points). This procedure will be used a bit later when treating the off-diagonal part of the symbol m_{22} and thus we will save a more detailed exposition for later. Alternatively one can use the paraproduct estimates described in [10].

Now we turn our attention towards the last possible situation in our decomposition of m_j, namely m_j^{22}. Using again "duality formula" (10), and preserving the previous notations, we claim that

$$(12)\quad m_j^{22}(\xi,\eta) = c\, e^{-i\Psi_\eta(\xi)}\, (\Psi''_\eta(\xi))^{1/2}\, 2^j\, \rho^*\left(2^j\,(\gamma')^{-1}(\frac{\xi}{\eta})\right) + \text{Error term}\,.$$

Indeed, set ϕ a smooth compactly supported function with $\operatorname{supp}\phi \subset \{x \mid \frac{1}{10} < |x| < 10\}$. Then, we rewrite[5] our symbol as:

$$m_j^{22}(\xi,\eta) = \sum_{m,n\in\mathbb{N}} m_{j,m,n}^{22}(\xi,\eta)$$

where

$$(13)\quad m_{j,m,n}^{22}(\xi,\eta) = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\frac{\xi}{2^j}t}\, e^{i\eta\gamma(\frac{t}{2^j})}\,\rho(t)\,dt\right)\phi\left(\frac{\xi}{2^{m+j}}\right)\phi\left(\frac{\eta}{2^{m+j}}\,\gamma'(\frac{1}{2^j})\right)\,.$$

Now based on the intuition built previously, we expect two different regimes: the stationary phase regime - represented by the "diagonal" terms ($m \approx n$) and the non-stationary regime - terms living far from diagonal, ie $|m-n| > C(\gamma) > 1$.

The terms far from diagonal are only contributing to the error term in (12), and they are treated as follows: since $|m-n| >> 1$ integrating once by parts we have

$$(14)\quad m_{j,m,n}^{22}(\xi,\eta) = \frac{1}{2^{\max\{m,n\}}}\,\tilde{m}_{j,m,n}^{22}(\xi,\eta)\,,$$

where $\tilde{m}_{j,m,n}^{22}$ is a symbol defined by (13) with just replacing ρ and ϕ with different same-structured smooth functions. If we set now $\mathcal{V}_{j,m,n}$ the bilinear operator having the symbol given by $m_{j,m,n}^{22}$, based on (14) for each fixed j we have

$$(15)\quad \|\mathcal{V}_{j,m,n}(f,g)\|_2 \lesssim_\gamma \frac{1}{2^{\max\{m,n\}}}\,\left\|\hat{f}(\cdot)\,\phi\left(\frac{\cdot}{2^{m+j}}\right)\right\|_2\left\|\hat{g}(\cdot)\,\phi\left(\frac{\cdot}{2^{n+j}}\,\gamma'(\frac{1}{2^j})\right)\right\|_2\,.$$

---

[5] Here we use the good localization of ρ, i.e. $\operatorname{supp}\rho \subseteq \left\{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid \frac{1}{4} < |t| < 1\right\}$

Taking now $\mathcal{V}_{m,n}(f,g) := \sum_j \mathcal{V}_{j,m,n}(f,g)$ and making essential use of hypothesis (1), by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have

$$\|\mathcal{V}_{m,n}(f,g)\|_1 \lesssim_\gamma \frac{1}{2^{\max\{m,n\}}} \|f\|_2 \, \|g\|_2 \, ,$$

which further implies

$$\left\| \sum_{\substack{m,n \\ |m-n|>>1}} \mathcal{V}_{m,n}(f,g) \right\|_1 \lesssim \|f\|_2 \, \|g\|_2 \, . \tag{16}$$

We now turn our attention towards the diagonal term. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed, we analyze the term $m^{22}_{j,m,m}(\xi,\, \eta)$.

Notice that from the properties of γ, there can not exist more than a (critical) point $t_m = t_m(\xi\,, \eta) \in R_+ \cap \operatorname{supp} \rho$ such that $\frac{\xi}{2^j} - \frac{\eta}{2^j}\,\gamma'(\frac{t_m}{2^j}) = 0$. If such a $t_m = 2^j\,(\gamma')^{-1}\left(\frac{\xi}{\eta}\right)$ exists define $V = V(\xi,\eta) := \{t\,|\,|t - t_m| \lesssim 2^{-\frac{m}{2}}\}$ else set $V = \emptyset$.

Lastly, define $\varphi_{\xi,\eta}(t) := -\frac{\xi}{2^j}\,t + \eta\,\gamma(\frac{t}{2^j})$.

Then for ξ, η such that $\phi\left(\frac{\xi}{2^{m+j}}\right)$, $\phi\left(\frac{\eta}{2^{n+j}}\,\gamma'(\frac{1}{2^j})\right) \neq 0$ we have (assume wlog that our integration is done only over $\mathbb{R}_+$)

$$m^{22}_{j,m,m}(\xi,\, \eta) \approx e^{i\,\varphi_{\xi,\eta}(t_m)} \int_V e^{i\,\int_{t_m}^t \varphi'_{\xi,\eta}(u)\,du} \rho(t)\,dt +$$

$$\int_{V^c} e^{i\,\varphi_{\xi,\eta}(t)} \, \frac{\rho^*(t)}{\eta\,2^{-j}\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\,\int_{t_m}^t \frac{2^{-2j}\gamma''(s2^{-j})}{2^{-j}\gamma'(2^{-j})}\,ds}\,dt = A(\xi,\eta) \,+\, B(\xi,\eta)\,.$$

Now for the first term using (2) we observe that

$$|\int_{t_m}^t \varphi'_{\xi,\eta}(u)\,du| \lesssim 1 \qquad \forall\; t \in V\,,$$

and hence using Taylor expansion and canonical considerations, one has

$$A(\xi,\eta) = e^{i\,\varphi_{\xi,\eta}(t_m)}\,2^{-\frac{m}{2}}\,\rho^*(t_m)\,, \tag{17}$$

with ρ^* a smooth function with same properties as ρ.

For the second term, suppose wlog that $j \in \mathbb{N}$; using (2) and (4) one has:

$$B(\xi,\eta) = \frac{1}{\eta 2^{-j}\gamma'(2^{-j})} \int_{V^c} e^{i\,\varphi_{\xi,\eta}(t)} \, \frac{\rho^*(t)}{\int_{t_m}^t [Q''(s) + Q''_j(s)]\,ds}\,dt\,,$$

which implies

$$B(\xi,\eta) \approx \frac{1}{2^{\frac{m}{2}}} \int_{|t-tm|\gtrsim 2^{-\frac{m}{2}}} e^{i\,\varphi_{\xi,\eta}(t)}\rho^*(t)\,. \tag{18}$$

Due to the good decay this last term constitutes as an error term and can be treated as previously the non-diagonal terms.

Putting together (17) and (18) we conclude that

(19)
$$m^{22}_{j,m,m}(\xi,\,\eta)=2^{-\frac{m}{2}}\,e^{i\,\varphi_{\xi,\eta}(t_m)}\,\phi\left(\frac{\xi}{2^{m+j}}\right)\,\phi\left(\frac{\eta}{2^{m+j}}\,\gamma'(\frac{1}{2^j})\right)+\text{Error term}\,,$$

thus proving (12).

Based on our previous considerations from now on it will be enough to only focuss on the main term v_j defined as

(20)
$$v_j(\xi,\eta)=\sum_{m\geq 0}\frac{1}{2^{m/2}}\,e^{-i\Psi_\eta(\xi)}\,\phi\left(\frac{\xi}{2^{m+j}}\right)\,\phi\left(\frac{\eta}{2^{m+j}}\,\gamma'(\frac{1}{2^j})\right)=\sum_{m\geq 0}v_{j,m}(\xi,\eta)\,.$$

Define now our essential pieces as

$$T_{j,m}(f,g)(x):=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\hat{f}(\xi)\hat{g}(\eta)v_{j,m}(\xi,\eta)e^{i\xi x}e^{i\eta x}d\xi d\eta \tag{21}$$

It remains now to show (and this constitutes the most difficult part of our result) that the operators $T_{j,m}$ obey the condition

$$\left\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z},m\geq 0}T_{j,m}(f,g)\right\|_1\lesssim\|f\|_2\,\|g\|_2\ . \tag{22}$$

The plan for proving (22) will be described in the next section.

4. **Elaborating on the key result**

From the above description our main theorem is reduced to the task of obtaining good bounds for each operator $T_{j,m}$. This aim is attained through the following

Theorem 2. *There exist* $\epsilon\in(0,1)$ *such that*

$$\|T_{j,m}(f,g)\|_1\lesssim_\gamma 2^{-\epsilon m}\,\|f\|_2\,\|g\|_2\ . \tag{23}$$

This entire section will be dedicated for properly shaping the above theorem.

Firstly, since we will no longer need to make use of the mean zero property of ρ from now on we will only focuss on the positive real axis and thus assume that $\operatorname{supp}\rho\subset(\frac{1}{4},1)$. Also from the Observations in Section 2, in what follows wlog we will assume that $\lim_{t\to 0}\gamma'(t)=0$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty}\gamma'(t)=\infty$.

Next, while not necessary, we will choose to rescale our problem and thus make the parallelism as well as the differences between our proof and Li's approach more transparent. Thus maintaining the notations from [11] we proceed as follows:

Using the scaling symmetry and depending on the values of j, we define the following operator:

- For $j > 0$ (thus $2^{-j} \to 0$)

$$B_{j,m}(f(\cdot), g(\cdot))(x) := [\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{\frac{1}{2}}\, T_{j,m}\left(f(2^{m+j}\cdot), g(\frac{2^{m+j}}{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]}\cdot)\right)(\frac{x\,[\gamma'(2^{-j})]}{2^{m+j}}).$$

Remark that

$$B_{j,m}(f,g)(x) =$$

$$2^{-\frac{m}{2}}\,[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(\xi)\,\hat{g}(\eta)\, e^{i(\gamma'(2^{-j})\xi+\eta)\,x}\, e^{-i\,2^m\,2^j\,\Psi_{\frac{\eta}{\gamma'(2^{-j})}}(\xi)}\,\phi(\xi)\,\phi(\eta)\,d\xi\,d\eta,$$

or equivalently

$$B_{j,m}(f,g)(x) =$$

$$[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(f * \check{\phi}\right)(\gamma'(2^{-j})x - 2^m t)\ \left(g * \check{\phi}\right)(x - \frac{2^{m+j}}{\gamma'(2^{-j})}\gamma(\frac{t}{2^j}))\,\rho(t)\,dt\,.$$

- For $j < 0$ (thus $2^{-j} \to \infty$)

$$B_{j,m}(f(\cdot), g(\cdot))(x) := [\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-\frac{1}{2}}\, T_{j,m}\left(f(2^{m+j}\cdot), g(\frac{2^{m+j}}{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]}\cdot)\right)(\frac{x}{2^{m+j}})\,.$$

As before, notice that

$$B_{j,m}(f,g)(x) =$$

$$2^{-\frac{m}{2}}\,[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(\xi)\,\hat{g}(\eta)\, e^{i(\xi+\frac{\eta}{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]})\,x}\, e^{-i\,2^m\,2^j\,\Psi_{\frac{\eta}{\gamma'(2^{-j})}}(\xi)}\,\phi(\xi)\,\phi(\eta)\,d\xi\,d\eta,$$

or equivalently

$$B_{j,m}(f,g)(x) =$$

$$[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(f * \check{\phi}\right)(x - 2^m t)\ \left(g * \check{\phi}\right)(\frac{x}{\gamma'(2^{-j})} - \frac{2^{m+j}}{\gamma'(2^{-j})}\gamma(\frac{t}{2^j}))\,\rho(t)\,dt\,.$$

With these definitions we see that the statement of Theorem 2 is equivalent with

Theorem 2 (reformulated). *There exist* $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ *such that*

$$\|B_{j,m}(f,g)\|_1 \lesssim_{\gamma} 2^{-\epsilon m}\,\|f\|_2\,\|g\|_2\ . \tag{24}$$

5. Discretization of our operator $B_{j,m}$

We start by saying that we will focuss on the case $j > 0$ as most of the reasonings for the other case ($j < 0$) are of similar nature. Thus in what follows one should think at 2^{-j} as being a very small quantity.

Before we should proceed with our discretization is worth mentioning several aspects that will help our understanding of the operator

$$B_{j,m}(f,g)(x) =$$

$$[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(f * \check{\phi}\right)(\gamma'(2^{-j})x - 2^m t)\ \left(g * \check{\phi}\right)(x - \frac{2^{m+j}}{\gamma'(2^{-j})}\gamma(\frac{t}{2^j}))\,\rho(t)\,dt\,.$$

Thus, based on the property (2) we make the following

Observations:

- for t varying inside $\operatorname{supp}\rho$, the space variable of g covers an interval of length 2^m (heuristically this means averaging the value of g along intervals of length 2^m).
- for the function f we see that for x variable to see a cycle of length 2^m one should let x to range in interval of length $\frac{2^m}{\gamma'(2^{-j})}$.

These observations have the following

Implications:

- the first observation suggests for g a Gabor-decomposition of the form
$$g(x)=\sum_{l,p}\langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle\ \varphi_{m,l,p}\ ,$$
where $\varphi_{m,l,p}(x)=2^{-\frac{m}{2}}\,\varphi(2^{-m}x-l)\,e^{i\,2^{-m}\,p\,x}$ with φ smooth such that $\operatorname{supp}\hat{\varphi}\subseteq[0,2]$.
- the second observation implies that it is enough to show L^1- bounds for $B_{j,m}$ relative to the interval $[0,\frac{2^m}{\gamma'(2^{-j})}]$. Consequently from now on, we will assume
$$B_{j,m}=B_{j,m}\,\chi_{[0,\frac{2^m}{\gamma'(2^{-j})}]}\ .$$

Next, we turn our attention towards the Fourier side of our operator

$$B_{j,m}(f,g)(x)=$$
$$2^{-\frac{m}{2}}\,[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{\frac{1}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\hat{f}(\xi)\,\hat{g}(\eta)\,e^{i(\gamma'(2^{-j})\xi+\eta)\,x}\,e^{-i\,2^m\,2^j\,\Psi_{\frac{\eta}{\gamma'(2^{-j})}}(\xi)}\,\phi(\xi)\,\phi(\eta)\,d\xi\,d\eta.$$

Now based on the (3), for $x\in J$, we have that

$$2^j\,(\gamma')^{-1}(x\,\gamma'(2^{-j}))=r(x)\,+\,r_j(x)\ . \tag{25}$$

Using now the above relation, we notice that up to a factor depending possibly only of j and η that can be absorbed in $\hat{g}$, for $\xi,\ \eta\in I$ with $\frac{\xi}{\eta}\in J$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&2^j\,\Psi_{\frac{\eta}{\gamma'(2^{-j})}}(\xi)=\int_\eta^\xi 2^j\,(\gamma')^{-1}(\tfrac{u}{\eta}\,\gamma'(2^{-j}))\,du\\&=\int_\eta^\xi r(\tfrac{u}{\eta})\,du\,+\,\int_\eta^\xi r_j(\tfrac{u}{\eta}):=\eta\,R(\tfrac{\xi}{\eta})\,+\,\eta\,R_j(\tfrac{\xi}{\eta})\,.\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Now since the R_j's are smooth and tend uniformly to zero we do expect that their contribution is negligible in the behavior of $B_{j,m}$; in what follows, for notational simplicity we will only write/keep the dominant oscillatory factor, namely the exponential given by R. Alternatively the reader can check that each of our reasonings bellow carry over smoothly in the presence of the error (all the estimates for R remain true for $R+R_j$).

Thus, as an intermediate decomposition for our bilinear operator we have

$$B_{j,m}(f,g)(x)=\sum_{l=0}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}\ \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}2^{-\frac{m}{2}}[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{\frac{1}{2}}\,\langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(\xi)\,\hat{\varphi}_{m,l,p}(\eta)\,,e^{i(\gamma'(2^{-j})\xi+\eta)\,x}\,e^{-i\,2^m\,\eta\,R(\frac{\xi}{\eta})}\,\phi(\xi)\,\phi(\eta)\,d\xi\,d\eta\,.$$

Next step is to decompose $B_{j,m}$ as a tensor product of two functions. For this we notice that for $\xi \in \operatorname{supp}\phi$ and $\eta \in \operatorname{supp}\hat{\varphi}_{m,l,p}$ we have

$$2^m\left|\eta\,R(\frac{\xi}{\eta})-\frac{p}{2^m}\,R(\frac{\xi}{\frac{p}{2^m}})\right|\lesssim_\gamma 1\,.$$

Canonical considerations (see below) are then reducing our task to treating the term [6]:

(27)

$$B_{j,m}(f,g)(x)=$$

$$\sum_{l=0}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}\sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} 2^{-\frac{m}{2}}\,[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{\frac{1}{2}}\,\langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle\;\mathcal{Q}_{m,p}f(\gamma'(2^{-j})\,x)\,\varphi_{m,l,p}(x)\,,$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q}_{m,p}f(x):=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\hat{f}(\xi)\,\phi(\xi)\,e^{-i\,p\,R(\frac{\xi}{\frac{p}{2^m}})}\,e^{i\,\xi\,x}\,d\xi\,.$$

Indeed, to see that this is enough we first notice that for $\eta,\eta_0\in\operatorname{supp}\varphi_{m,l,p}$ (hence $|2^m(\eta-\eta_0)|\lesssim 1$) and $h(\xi,\eta):=\frac{\eta\,R(\frac{\xi}{\eta})-\eta_0\,R(\frac{\xi}{\eta_0})}{\eta-\eta_0}$ we have $h\in C^{N-1}$ and thus for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$ we deduce $h^k(\xi,\eta)=\sum_{n_1,n_2\in\mathbb{Z}} d_{k,n_1,n_2}\,e^{i\xi\,n_1}\,e^{i\eta\,n_2}$, with

$$|d_{k,n_1,n_2}|\lesssim\frac{k^r}{|n_1|^r+|n_2|^r}\,\|h\|_{L^\infty}^{k-r}\qquad\forall\,0\le r\le N-1.$$

Then, using the Taylor expansion

$$e^{i\,2^m(\eta-\eta_0)\,h(\xi,\eta)}=\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\frac{[2^m(\eta-\eta_0)]^k}{k!}\sum_{n_1,n_2\in\mathbb{Z}}d_{k,n_1,n_2}\,e^{i\xi\,n_1}\,e^{i\eta\,n_2}$$

and the decay of the coefficients d_{k,n_1,n_2} we have that indeed $B_{j,m}$ can be reduced to a discretized version of type (27).

Remark now that we have

$$\left|\mathcal{Q}_{m,p}f(x)-\mathcal{Q}_{m,p}f(x')\right|\lesssim|x-x'|\,\|f\|_2\,.\tag{28}$$

This implies that $\mathcal{Q}_{m,p}f$ "sees" the exterior environment in unit steps. As a consequence, will become natural to apply two types of discretizations depending on the relative sizes of the "moral" support of $\mathcal{Q}_{m,p}f(\gamma'(2^{-j})\,\cdot)$ and of the support of $\varphi_{m,l,p}(\cdot)$.

More precisely, we claim that will be enough to bound the following discretized operators:

- For $\gamma'(2^{-j})>2^{-m}$ we set

$$\tilde{B}_{j,m}(f,g)(x)=2^{-m}\sum_{l=0}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}\sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}\sum_{k=0}^{2^m\gamma'(2^{-j})}\langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_{m,p}f(l\,2^m\gamma'(2^{-j})+k)\,\varphi_{-\log_2(\gamma'(2^{-j})),l2^m\gamma'(2^{-j})+k,p2^{-m}[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}(x)\,.$$

---

[6] We will use the same notation for this "discretized" version.

- For $\gamma'(2^{-j}) \leq 2^{-m}$ we set

$$\tilde{B}_{j,m}(f,g)(x) =$$

$$2^{-\frac{m}{2}}[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{l=0}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}} \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} \langle g, \varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle \; \mathcal{Q}_{m,p}f(l\,2^m\gamma'(2^{-j}))\,\varphi_{m,l,p}(x)\;.$$

To see how we can reduce the operator $B_{j,m}$ to the corresponding discretized version $\tilde{B}_{j,m}$ we proceed as follows:

Let us suppose $\gamma'(2^{-j}) \leq 2^{-m}$ (the other case has a similar treatment).

Observe that for $x \in \operatorname{supp} B_{j,m}$ and l fixed we have

$$\mathcal{Q}_{m,p}f(\gamma'(2^{-j})\,x) =$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(\xi)\,\phi(\xi)\,e^{-i\,p\,R(\frac{\frac{\xi}{p}}{2^m})}\;e^{i\,\xi\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\,2^m\,l}\;e^{i\,\xi\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\,2^m\,(2^{-m}\,x-l)}\,d\xi =$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\gamma'(2^{-j})\,2^m)^k}{k!}\,(2^{-m}\,x-l)^k \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(\xi)\,\phi(\xi)\,\xi^k\,e^{-i\,p\,R(\frac{\frac{\xi}{p}}{2^m})}\;e^{i\,\xi\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\,2^m\,l}\,d\xi$$

Now, for $\eta, \tau \in S(\mathbb{R})$ such that η, $\hat{\tau}$ compactly supported we set

$$\mathcal{Q}^{\eta}_{m,p}f(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(\xi)\,\eta(\xi)\,e^{-i\,p\,R(\frac{\frac{\xi}{p}}{2^m})}\;e^{i\,\xi\,x}\,d\xi\;,$$

and with the previous notations define

$$\tilde{B}^{\varphi,\eta,\tau}_{j,m}(f,g)(x) =$$

$$2^{-\frac{m}{2}}[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{l=0}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}} \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} \langle g, \varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle \; \mathcal{Q}^{\eta}_{m,p}f(l\,2^m\gamma'(2^{-j}))\,\tau_{m,l,p}(x)\;.$$

Based on the above considerations we deduce that

$$B_{j,m}(f,g)(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\gamma'(2^{-j})\,2^m)^k}{k!}\,\tilde{B}^{\varphi,\phi_k,\varphi_k}_{j,m}(f,g)(x)\;, \tag{29}$$

where $\phi_k(\xi) := \phi(\xi)\,\xi^k$ and $\varphi_k(x) := \varphi(x)\,x^k$.

In the next section we will provide bounds on $\tilde{B}^{\varphi,\eta,\tau}_{j,m}$ which will only give dependence on the parameter m (exponential decay) and on the L^2 norms of the functions η and τ. Thus from (29) and the properties of ϕ, φ one deduces that whatever bounds we produce for $\tilde{B}^{\varphi,\phi,\varphi}_{j,m}$ the same bound (up to an absolute constant) holds for the full operator $B_{j,m}$. (In what follows for notational simplicity we will refer to $\tilde{B}^{\varphi,\phi,\varphi}_{j,m}$ as just simply $B_{j,m}$).

This ends the discretization of our operator.

6. **The proof of the main theorem**

In this section we will prove the boundedness of the bilinear Hilbert transform along the curve Γ.

Define

$$\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} B_{j,m}(f,g)(x)h(x)dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)D_{j,m}(g,h)(x)dx \,. \tag{30}$$

Then, Theorem 2 is a direct consequence of the following

Theorem 3. *There exists* $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ *such that*

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h)| \lesssim_{\gamma} 2^{-\epsilon m} \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2 \|h\|_{\infty} \,.$$

Further, the above theorem follows from

Proposition 1. *For* $\gamma'(2^{-j}) > 2^{-m}$ *we have that*

$$\|B_{j,m}(f,g)\|_1 \lesssim_{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{m}{16}} \|f\|_2 \, \|g\|_2 \,.$$

Proposition 2. *For* $\gamma'(2^{-j}) \leq 2^{-m}$ *we have that*

$$\|D_{j,m}(g,h)\|_2 \lesssim_{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{m}{4}} \|g\|_2 \|h\|_{\infty} \,.$$

Proof of Proposition 2.

Making use of the discretization of $B_{j,m}$ for $\gamma'(2^{-j}) \leq 2^{-m}$ described in Section 4, and using the dual expression (30), we have

$$D_{j,m}(g,h) = 2^{-\frac{m}{2}} [\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{l=0}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}} \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} \langle g, \varphi_{m,l,p} \rangle \, \langle h, \varphi_{m,l,p} \rangle \, \psi_{m,l,p}(x) \,,$$

where $\hat{\psi}_{m,l,p}(\xi) := e^{-i\,p\,R(\frac{\xi}{\frac{p}{2^m}})} \, e^{i\,l\,2^m\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\,\xi} \, \phi(\xi)$.

Now, the first natural step is to understand the interaction

$$\left\langle \psi_{m,l,p}, \psi_{m,l',p'} \right\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\,[p\,R(\frac{\xi}{\frac{p}{2^m}}) - p'\,R(\frac{\xi}{\frac{p'}{2^m}})]} \, e^{i\,\gamma'(2^{-j})(l-l')\,2^m \xi} \, \phi(\xi)\, d\xi \,. \tag{31}$$

Applying the change of variable $\xi \to \frac{t}{2^m}$ and using the stationary phase principle (see also relation (10)) with $\Phi(t) = \Phi_{p,p'}(t) := p\,R(\frac{t}{p}) - p'\,R(\frac{t}{p'})$ (and $\Psi = \Psi_{p,p'}$ the corresponding dual function) we deduce that

(32)

$$\left| \left\langle \psi_{m,l,p}, \psi_{m,l',p'} \right\rangle \right| \lesssim_{\gamma}$$

$$|\Phi''_{p,p'}(\Psi'_{p,p'}(\gamma'(2^{-j})(l-l')))|^{-1/2}\, 2^{-m}\, |\phi^*(2^{-m}\, \Psi'_{p,p'}(\gamma'(2^{-j})(l-l')))| \; + \; \text{Error} \,,$$

where here $\phi^* \in C^N(R)$ with $\operatorname{supp} \phi^* \subseteq \operatorname{supp} \phi$ while the error term obeys

$$\text{Error} \lesssim \frac{1}{1 + |p-p'| + 2^m\, \gamma'(2^{-j})\, |l-l'|} \,. \tag{33}$$

We will now analyze the components of the main term in (32):

First we want to see in what conditions is the main term nonzero, *i.e.*

$$\phi^*(2^{-m}\,\Psi'_{p,p'}(\gamma'(2^{-j})(l-l')))\neq 0\,. \tag{34}$$

Thus, setting $2^{-m}\,\Psi'_{p,p'}(\gamma'(2^{-j})(l-l')) := t_0$ we must have $t_0 \approx 1$. But based on the phase duality we must have $\gamma'(2^{-j})(l-l') = \Phi'_{p,p'}(2^m\,t_0)$. On the other hand using the structure of $\Phi_{p,p'}$ and the mean value theorem we have

$$\Phi'_{p,p'}(t) = R'(\frac{t}{p}) - R'(\frac{t}{p'}) = t(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{p'})\,R''(c_{pp'})$$

with $|t|\approx 2^m$ and $|c_{pp'}|\approx 1$. Using now (4) we deduce that (34) is equivalent with

$$2^m\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\,|l-l'| \approx |p-p'|\,. \tag{35}$$

Next we claim that

$$|\Phi''_{p,p'}(\Psi'_{p,p'}(\gamma'(2^{-j})(l-l')))| \gtrsim_\gamma 2^{-m}\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\,|l-l'|\,. \tag{36}$$

Using that $\Phi_{p,p'}$, $\Psi_{p,p'}$ are dual phases, (36) is a direct consequence of the fact that for $|x|\approx 2^m$ we have

$$|\Phi''_{p,p'}(x)| \gtrsim_\gamma |x|^{-1}\,|\Phi'_{p,p'}(x)|$$

which further is implied by the hypothesis (4) and (5).

Thus, taking now $|l-l'|\approx 2^r\,|\gamma'(2^{-j})|^{-1}\,2^{-m}$ (with $r\leq m$) we conclude that in the critical regime (when we have a stationary point in the phase *i.e.* the contribution of the interaction is large) we have

$$|\left\langle \psi_{m,l,p}, \psi_{m,l',p'}\right\rangle| \lesssim_\gamma 2^{-r/2}\,. \tag{37}$$

From (35) and (37), we deduce that the main term contribution can be bounded as follows:

$$\|D^{Main}_{j,m}(g,h)\|_2^2 \lesssim_\gamma 2^{-m}\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\sum_{r=0}^{m}\;\sum_{\substack{l,l'=0\\ |l-l'|\approx 2^r 2^{-m}[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}\;\sum_{\substack{p,p'=0\\ |p-p'|\approx 2^r}}^{2^m}\frac{1}{2^{r/2}}$$

$$|\left\langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\right\rangle|\,|\left\langle g,\varphi_{m,l',p'}\right\rangle|\,|\left\langle h,\varphi_{m,l,p}\right\rangle|\,|\left\langle h,\varphi_{m,l',p'}\right\rangle| \lesssim$$

$$2^{-m}\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\sum_{r=0}^{m}\;\sum_{\substack{l,l'=0\\ |l-l'|\approx 2^r 2^{-m}[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}\;\sum_{\substack{p,p'=0\\ |p-p'|\approx 2^r}}^{2^m}\frac{1}{2^{r/2}}|\left\langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\right\rangle|^2|\left\langle h,\varphi_{m,l',p'}\right\rangle|^2$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-m}\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\sum_{r=0}^{m}\;\sum_{l=0}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}\;\sum_{p=0}^{2^m}\frac{1}{2^{r/2}}|\left\langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\right\rangle|^2\,2^r\,[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}\,\|h\|_\infty^2$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-m/2}\,\|g\|_2^2\,\|h\|_\infty^2\,.$$

For the error term we no longer have a condition of the type (35) but instead we have the extra decay offered by (33). Thus, proceeding as before we easily deduce that

$$\|D^{Err}_{j,m}(g,h)\|_2^2 \lesssim_\gamma 2^{-m}\,\gamma'(2^{-j}) \sum_{r=0}^{m} \sum_{\substack{l,l'=0 \\ |l-l'|\approx 2^r 2^{-m}[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}} \sum_{p,p'=0}^{2^m} \frac{1}{2^r}$$

$$|\langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle\,||\left\langle g,\varphi_{m,l',p'}\right\rangle\,||\langle h,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle\,||\left\langle h,\varphi_{m,l',p'}\right\rangle\,| \lesssim$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-m}\,\gamma'(2^{-j}) \sum_{r=0}^{m} \sum_{l=0}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}} \sum_{p=0}^{2^m} \frac{1}{2^r} |\langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle\,|^2\, 2^r\,[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}\,\|h\|_\infty^2$$

$$\lesssim m\,2^{-m}\,\|g\|_2^2\,\|h\|_\infty^2\,.$$

Proof of Proposition 1.

Our intention here is to show that for $\gamma'(2^{-j}) > 2^{-m}$ we have that

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h)| \lesssim_\gamma 2^{-\epsilon m}\|f\|_2\|g\|_2\|h\|_\infty$$

Our proof will be split in two[7] cases according with the relative size of $\gamma'(2^{-j})$ and 2^{-m}. More precisely we have

First regime: $2^m\,\gamma'(2^{-j})$ "small".

For this scenario, as described in Section 4, we will use the following discretization of our operator:

$$B_{j,m}(f,g)(x) = 2^{-m} \sum_{l=0}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}} \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} \sum_{k=0}^{2^m\gamma'(2^{-j})} \langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_{m,p} f(l\,2^m\gamma'(2^{-j})+k)\,\varphi_{-\log_2(\gamma'(2^{-j})),l2^m\gamma'(2^{-j})+k,p2^{-m}[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}(x)\,.$$

Using the dual identity

$$\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} B_{j,m}(f,g)(x)h(x)dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)D_{j,m}(g,h)(x)dx\,,$$

the above discretization can be rephrased as follows

$$D_{j,m}(g,h) = 2^{-m} \sum_{l=0}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}} \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} \sum_{k=0}^{2^m\gamma'(2^{-j})} \langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle\,\langle h,\tilde\varphi_{m,l,k,p}\rangle\,\psi_{m,l,k,p}\,,$$

where we have set $\tilde\varphi_{m,l,k,p} := \varphi_{-\log_2(\gamma'(2^{-j})),l2^m\gamma'(2^{-j})+k,p2^{-m}[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}$ and $\hat\psi_{m,l,k,p}(\xi) := e^{-i\,p\,R(\frac{\xi}{\frac{p}{2^m}})}\,e^{i\,(l\,2^m\,\gamma'(2^{-j})+k)\,\xi}\,\phi(\xi)\,.$

---

[7] See the Appendix for a a more elaborate discussion of why we have two different case in this proof.

Next, as expected, we isolate the interaction term

(38)
$$\left\langle \psi_{m,l,k,p}, \psi_{m,l',k',p'} \right\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i\,[p\,R(\frac{\xi}{\frac{p}{2^m}})-p'\,R(\frac{\xi}{\frac{p'}{2^m}})]}\, e^{i\,(\gamma'(2^{-j})(l-l')\,2^m+k-k')\xi}\,\phi(\xi)\,d\xi.$$

Further, applying the stationary phase principle (and keeping the same notation as those addressing (32)) we deduce

(39)
$$|\left\langle \psi_{m,l,k,p}, \psi_{m,l',k',p'} \right\rangle| \lesssim_\gamma$$
$$|\Psi''(\gamma'(2^{-j})(l-l'))|^{1/2}\,2^{-m}\,|\phi^*(2^{-m}\,\Psi'(\gamma'(2^{-j})(l-l')))| \,+\, \text{Error term}\,.$$

where as before $\phi^* \in C^N(R)$ with $\operatorname{supp}\phi^* \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\phi$.

Now, following the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 2, we have that in the critical regime (*i.e.* main term nonzero) the condition $|l-l'| \approx 2^r\,[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}\,2^{-m}$ (with $r \leq m$) implies $|p-p'| \approx 2^r$ case in which we further have

$$|\left\langle \psi_{m,l,k,p}, \psi_{m,l',k',p'} \right\rangle| \lesssim_\gamma 2^{-r/2}\,. \tag{40}$$

Using now (40) we deduce[8]

$$\|D_{j,m}(g,h)\|_2^2 \lesssim_\gamma 2^{-2m} \sum_{r=0}^{m} \sum_{\substack{l,l'=0\\ |l-l'|\approx 2^r 2^{-m}[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}} \sum_{\substack{p,p'=0\\ |p-p'|\approx 2^r}}^{2^m} \sum_{k,k'=0}^{2^m\gamma'(2^{-j})}$$
$$\frac{1}{2^{r/2}}\,|\left\langle g, \varphi_{m,l,p}\right\rangle|\,|\left\langle g, \varphi_{m,l',p'}\right\rangle|\,|\left\langle h, \tilde{\varphi}_{m,l,k,p}\right\rangle|\,|\left\langle h, \tilde{\varphi}_{m,l',k',p'}\right\rangle|$$
$$\lesssim 2^{-2m} \sum_{r=0}^{m} \sum_{\substack{l,l'=0\\ |l-l'|\approx 2^r 2^{-m}[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}}}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}} \sum_{\substack{p,p'=0\\ |p-p'|\approx 2^r}}^{2^m} \sum_{k,k'=0}^{2^m\gamma'(2^{-j})}$$
$$\frac{1}{2^{r/2}}\,|\left\langle g, \varphi_{m,l,p}\right\rangle|^2\,|\left\langle h, \tilde{\varphi}_{m,l',k',p'}\right\rangle|^2$$
$$\lesssim 2^{-2m} \sum_{r=0}^{m} \sum_{l=0}^{[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}} \sum_{p=0}^{2^m} \frac{1}{2^{r/2}}|\left\langle g, \varphi_{m,l,p}\right\rangle|^2\,(2^m\gamma'(2^{-j}))^2\,2^r\,[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{-1}\,\|h\|_\infty^2$$
$$\lesssim 2^{m/2}\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\,\|g\|_2^2\,\|h\|_\infty^2\,.$$

Thus we conclude that for $\gamma'(2^{-j}) > 2^{-m}$

$$\|D_{j,m}(g,h)\|_2^2 \lesssim_\gamma 2^{m/2}\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\,\|g\|_2^2\,\|h\|_\infty^2\,. \tag{41}$$

Observe that (41) is very efficient when $\gamma'(2^{-j})$ close to 2^{-m} but very inefficient when $\gamma'(2^{-j})$ is large (*i.e.* close to 1). For this second situation we need to choose a different approach.

---

[8] Here we ignore the error term.

Second regime: $2^m\,\gamma'(2^{-j})$ "large".

In this case, we will follow the argument in [11], and choose[9] not to work with the discretized form of our operator $B_{j,m}$ but rather with the compact formulation given by:

(42)

$$B_{j,m}(f,g)(x) =$$

$$2^{-\frac{m}{2}}\,[\gamma'(2^{-j})]^{\frac{1}{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\hat{f}(\xi)\,\hat{g}(\eta)\,e^{i(\gamma'(2^{-j})\xi+\eta)\,x}\,e^{-i\,2^m\,\eta\,R(\frac{\xi}{\eta})}\,\phi(\xi)\,\phi(\eta)\,d\xi\,d\eta\,.$$

Our intention here is to estimate first the L^2-norm of $B_{j,m}$ and hope that the highly oscillatory behavior of the multiplier will produce some cancelation in the kernel of the operator (this is nothing else then rephrasing the mechanism behind the TT^* method). As a consequence we have:

$$\|B_{j,m}(f,g)\|_2^2 = 2^{-m}\gamma'(2^{-j})\int\int\int\int_{\substack{\mathbb{R}^4\\ \gamma'(2^{-j})\xi+\eta=\gamma'(2^{-j})\xi_1+\eta_1}}$$

$$\hat{f}(\xi)\,\hat{g}(\eta)\,\overline{\hat{f}(\xi_1)}\,\overline{\hat{g}(\eta_1)}\,e^{-i\,2^m\,\eta\,R(\frac{\xi}{\eta})}\,\phi(\xi)\,\phi(\eta)\,e^{i\,2^m\,\eta_1\,R(\frac{\xi_1}{\eta_1})}\,\overline{\phi(\xi_1)}\,\overline{\phi(\eta_1)}\,d\xi\,d\eta\,d\xi_1\,d\eta_1$$

$$= 2^{-m}\gamma'(2^{-j})\int\int\int F_\tau(\xi)\,G_\tau(\eta)\,e^{-i\,2^m\,\varphi_\tau(\xi,\eta)}\,d\xi\,d\eta\,d\tau\,,$$

where here we have set

$$F_\tau(\xi) := \hat{f}\phi(\xi)\,\overline{\hat{f}}\phi(\xi-\tau)\,,\quad G_\tau(\eta) := \hat{g}\phi(\eta)\,\overline{\hat{g}\phi}(\eta+\gamma'(2^{-j})\tau)$$

$$\text{and}\quad \varphi_\tau(\xi,\eta) := \eta\,R(\frac{\xi}{\eta}) - (\eta+\gamma'(2^{-j})\tau)R(\frac{\xi-\tau}{\eta+\gamma'(2^{-j})\tau})\,.$$

From the conditions imposed on the curve γ (here is the key point where one makes use of (5)) we deduce that

$$|\partial_\xi\partial_\eta\varphi_\tau(\xi,\eta)| \gtrsim |\tau|$$

relation which implies high oscillatory behavior of the phase and thus enough cancelation for obtaining some decay. These observation can be captured in the use of a variant of (non) stationary phase principle in two dimensions found in literature under the name of Hörmander principle; more exactly, we have:

(43)

$$|\int\int F_\tau(\xi)\,G_\tau(\eta)\,e^{-i\,2^m\,\varphi_\tau(\xi,\eta)}\,d\xi\,d\eta| \lesssim \min\{1,|2^m\tau|^{-1/2}\}\,\|F_\tau\|_2\,\|G_\tau\|_2\,.$$

Applying now (43) together with a variational argument we have

$$\|B_{j,m}(f,g)\|_2^2$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-m}\,\gamma'(2^{-j})\sup_{u\in[0,1]}\{u\,\|f\|_2^2\,\|g\|_2^2\,+\,(2^m u)^{-1/2}\int_{|\tau|\geq u}\|F_\tau\|_2\,\|G_\tau\|_2\,d\tau\}$$

---

[9] See the Appendix for more details on this topic.

$$\lesssim 2^{-m}\gamma'(2^{-j})\,\|f\|_2^2\,\|g\|_2^2\,\sup_{u\in[0,1]}\{u\,+\,u^{-\frac{1}{2}}\,(2^m\,\gamma'(2^{-j}))^{-\frac{1}{2}}\}\,,$$

which implies

$$\|B_{j,m}(f,g)\|_2 \lesssim (2^{-m}\gamma'(2^{-j}))^{\frac{1}{2}}\,(2^m\,\gamma'(2^{-j}))^{-\frac{1}{6}}\,\|f\|_2\,\|g\|_2\,. \tag{44}$$

Finally, using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\|B_{j,m}(f,g)\|_1 \lesssim (2^m\,\gamma'(2^{-j}))^{-\frac{1}{6}}\,\|f\|_2\,\|g\|_2\,. \tag{45}$$

Combining now the conclusions of the previous approaches, more exactly, based on (41) and (45) we conclude

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h)| \lesssim_{\gamma} \min\{(2^{m/2}\,\gamma'(2^{-j}))^{\frac{1}{2}},\,(2^m\,\gamma'(2^{-j}))^{-\frac{1}{6}}\}\,\|f\|_2\|g\|_2\|h\|_\infty\,,$$

which implies

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h)| \lesssim_{\gamma} 2^{-\frac{m}{16}}\,\|f\|_2\|g\|_2\|h\|_\infty\,,$$

thus ending the proof of Proposition 1.

7. REMARKS

In this section we will discuss some possible ways of extending our result as well as some other interesting open problems that naturally arise from the present paper.

We start by briefly mentioning that our Main Theorem is likely to be phrased for a larger range of indices; thus we do expect a bound of the type $L^p(\mathbb{R})\times L^q(\mathbb{R})\,\rightarrow\,L^r(\mathbb{R})$ with the obvious homogeneity condition $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=\frac{1}{r}$ and for some particular range for $p,q>1$ and $r\geq 1$. Such a bound should be obtained for the local L^2 case. One may wish to investigate the maximal possible range for these indices.

In another context, we do not know if it is possible for one to remove the conditions (5) from the definitions of the "non-flat" curves near 0 or ∞. Also would be nice if one could replace the asymptotic behavior condition (2), at which we add (4) with some weaker variant resembling (6). For example, a curve of the form $\gamma(t)=e^t$ near infinity is obviously not slowly varying and does not obey the corresponding (2) hence its not in the class $\mathcal{NF}_\infty$. On the other hand we see no obvious obstruction for why a result as in the Main Theorem shouldn't be transferable to this particular choice of γ.

Another direction of investigation should concern the limiting situation when our curve becomes very close to being a "line", or with other words infinitely flat. One such example can be provided by $\gamma(t)=|t|\,\log|t|$. In a situation like this we do not expect a summation in "scales" as in the proof of our theorem but rather something closer to the approach of the classical bilinear Hilbert transform where one needs to make use of the concept of tree and organize families of such trees depending on their "size". A further step is made if one allows γ to also oscillate, like for example $\gamma(t) = t\,\sin t$, $\gamma(t) = t\,e^{\alpha\,\frac{1}{t}}\,\sin\frac{1}{t}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ e.t.c..

Most of these questions can be visualized as part of a programm that comes to understand the following

Open problem. *As before, for* $\Gamma = (t, -\gamma(t))$, *define the bilinear Hilbert transform* H_Γ *along the curve* Γ *as*

$$H_\Gamma : S(\mathbb{R}) \times S(\mathbb{R}) \longmapsto S'(\mathbb{R})$$

$$H_\Gamma(f,g)(x) := p.v. \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x-t)g(x+\gamma(t))\frac{dt}{t}\,.$$

What is the largest function space

$$Y \subset C_H := \{\gamma \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}) \,|\, m(\xi) := p.v. \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\,(t+\gamma(t))\,\xi}\,\frac{dt}{t} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})\}$$

for which the condition $\gamma \in Y$ *assures that* H_Γ *extends boundedly from* $L^2(\mathbb{R}) \times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ *to* $L^1(\mathbb{R})$*?*

Now philosophically, we do expect that any general treatment of the above question should distinguish between the flat and non-flat cases and treat them accordingly, combining the method presented here with the deeper and more complicated approach in [12], [13]. As a principle, we do notice that the presence of the curvature makes the treatment of this problem easier, as we do obtain a scale-type decay. Making now a parallel (that accounts for this principle), we do expect that for example the difficult open question regarding the boundedness of the trilinear Hilbert transform

$$T(f,g,h)(x) := p.v. \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x+t)\,g(x+2t)\,h(x+3t)\,\frac{dt}{t} \tag{46}$$

say from $L^4(\mathbb{R}) \times L^4(\mathbb{R}) \times L^4(\mathbb{R})$ to $L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\mathbb{R})$ should have a significantly easier correspondent "curved" type model as given for example by the question of providing same bounds for the operator

$$T_C(f,g,h)(x) := p.v. \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x+t)\,g(x+t^2)\,h(x+t^3)\,\frac{dt}{t}\,. \tag{47}$$

One can further generalize (47) to trilinear operators integrated over more general families of curves (see also [11]) or, in another direction extend these questions to the $n-$linear setting.

Finally, as another toy model in trying to better understand (46) one can ask the problem of providing bounds of the form $L^p(\mathbb{R}) \times L^q(\mathbb{R}) \times L^r(\mathbb{R})$ to $L^s(\mathbb{R})$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{s}$, $p, q > 1$ and $r = \infty$ for the operator given by

$$T(f,g,h)(x) := p.v. \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x+t)\,g(x+2t)\,h(x+t^2)\,\frac{dt}{t}\,. \tag{48}$$

An answer that involves a nontrivial range to this problem would contain some range of exponents from the (flat and non-flat) bilinear Hilbert transform and hence will have a level of difficulty situated between that of the bilinear Hilbert transform and that of the trilinear one.

8. Appendix

8.1. **A comparative discussion.**

In this section, for the particular case $\gamma(t)=t^d$ with ($d\in\mathbb{N}, d\geq 2$), we briefly make a parallel between our approach and Li's one.

In [11] he proves the following

Theorem. *If* $\gamma(t)=t^d$, $d\in\mathbb{N}$, $d\geq 2$ *then:*
For $\gamma'(2^{-j})>2^{-m}$ *we have*

$$\|B_{j,m}(f,g)\|_1 \lesssim 2^{\frac{(d-1)|j|-m}{8}}\,\|f\|_2\,\|g\|_2\ .$$

For $\gamma'(2^{-j})\leq 2^{-m}$ *we have*

$$\|B_{j,m}(f,g)\|_1 \lesssim \max\{2^{-\frac{(d-1)|j|-m}{3}},\,2^{-\delta\,m}\}\,\|f\|_2\,\|g\|_2\ ,$$

where here $\delta>0$ *is some absolute constant.*

In Li's approach, the operator $B_{j,m}$ is not discretized but rather embedded in a trilinear expression. The key ingredient used there is the $\sigma-$uniformity notion introduced in [3], and inspired by the work of Gowers in [7].

Our intention is to show how the $\sigma-$uniformity concept can be adapted to our discretized setting and naturally bring to the desired conclusion. The entire discussion is striped as much as possible of technical details exactly for making the analogies and comparisons transparent.

As explained, we will focuss on the boundedness properties of the operator

$$H_{\Gamma}(f,g)(x):=\text{p.v.}\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x-t)g(x+t^d)\frac{dt}{t}\ .$$

With the previous notations, the $L^2(\mathbb{R})\times L^2(\mathbb{R})$ to $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ boundedness of the operator H_{Γ} follows[10] from our Main Theorem as a consequence of:

---

[10] Notice that our bounds for $\|B_{j,m}\|_1$ are significantly improved and in particular are independent of the degree of the monomial. This is a natural consequence of the key ingredient involved in the proof: the non-vanishing curvature condition (4) which focusses on the second derivative of γ and hence aiming for $2^{-\frac{m}{2}}$-decay.

Proposition $1'$ *For* $\gamma'(2^{-j}) > 2^{-m}$ *we have that*

$$\|B_{j,m}(f,g)\|_1 \lesssim_\gamma 2^{-\frac{m}{16}} \, \|f\|_2 \, \|g\|_2 \ .$$

Proposition $2'$ *For* $\gamma'(2^{-j}) \le 2^{-m}$ *we have that*

$$\|D_{j,m}(g,h)\|_2 \lesssim_\gamma 2^{-\frac{m}{4}} \|g\|_2 \|h\|_\infty \, .$$

In what follows we will only discuss the second proposition.

8.1.1. ***Proof of Proposition*** $2'$ ***(interaction approach).***

$$D_{j,m}(g,h) = 2^{-\frac{m}{2} - \frac{j(d-1)}{2}} \sum_{l=0}^{2^{j(d-1)}} \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} \langle g, \varphi_{m,l,p} \rangle \ \langle h, \varphi_{m,l,p} \rangle \ \psi_{m,l,p}(x) \ ,$$

where $\hat{\psi}_{m,l,p}(\xi) := \ e^{i \, c_d \, \frac{(2^m \xi)^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}{p^{\frac{1}{d-1}}}} \ e^{i \, l \, 2^{m-j(d-1)} \, \xi} \ \phi(\xi) \ .$

Further we notice that

$$\left\langle \psi_{m,l,p}, \psi_{m,l',p'} \right\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i \, c_d \, (\frac{1}{p^{\frac{1}{d-1}}} - \frac{1}{p'^{\frac{1}{d-1}}}) \, (2^m \xi)^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} \ e^{i \, 2^{m-j(d-1)} \, (l-l') \, \xi} \ \phi(\xi) \, d\xi \ .$$

Using now relation (10) (and replacing d with $\frac{d}{d-1}$) we deduce that

(49)
$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-i \, a \, \xi^{\frac{d}{d-1}}} \ e^{-i \, b \, \xi} \ \phi(\xi) \, d\xi = \ c_d \, \frac{1}{a^{\frac{d-1}{d}}} \, \frac{1}{1 + |\frac{b}{a^{\frac{d-1}{d}}}|^{\frac{2-d}{2}}} \ \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i \, c_d \, \frac{(-u+b)^d}{a^{d-1}}} \ \hat{\phi}(u) \, du \ .$$

Also we have the approximation formula ($|a| > 10$)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i \, c_d \, \frac{(-u+b)^d}{a^{d-1}}} \ \hat{\phi}(u) \, du \approx c_d \, e^{i \, c_d \, \frac{b^d}{a^{d-1}}} \ \phi(c_d \, \frac{b^{d-1}}{a^{d-1}}) \ . \tag{50}$$

In our case

$$a = c_d \, (\frac{1}{p^{\frac{1}{d-1}}} - \frac{1}{p'^{\frac{1}{d-1}}}) \, (2^m)^{\frac{d}{d-1}} \quad \Rightarrow \quad |a| \approx |p - p'| \, ,$$

and

$$b = 2^{m-j(d-1)} (l - l') \, .$$

Consequently

$$| \left\langle \psi_{m,l,p}, \psi_{m,l',p'} \right\rangle | \lesssim_d$$

$$\frac{1}{|p-p'|^{\frac{d-1}{d}}} \, \frac{1}{1 + (\frac{2^{m-j(d-1)}|l-l'|}{|p-p'|^{\frac{d-1}{d}}})^{\frac{2-d}{2}}} \, \phi\left(c(d) \ \left[\frac{2^{m-j(d-1)}|l-l'|}{|p-p'|} \right]^{d-1} \right) + \text{Error} \, .$$

For the main term contribution we have

$$\|D_{j,m}^{Main}(g,h)\|_2^2 \lesssim_d 2^{-m-j(d-1)} \sum_{r=0}^{m} \sum_{\substack{l,l'=0\\ |l-l'|\approx 2^r 2^{(d-1)j-m}}}^{2^{j(d-1)}} \sum_{\substack{p,p'=0\\ |p-p'|\approx 2^r}}^{2^m} \frac{1}{2^{r/2}}$$

$$|\langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle \ || \left\langle g,\varphi_{m,l',p'}\right\rangle \ || \langle h,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle \ || \left\langle h,\varphi_{m,l',p'}\right\rangle \ | \lesssim$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-m-j(d-1)} \sum_{r=0}^{m} \sum_{\substack{l,l'=0\\ |l-l'|\approx 2^r 2^{j(d-1)-m}}}^{2^{j(d-1)}} \sum_{\substack{p,p'=0\\ |p-p'|\approx 2^r}}^{2^m} \frac{1}{2^{r/2}} | \langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle \ |^2 \left| \left\langle h,\varphi_{m,l',p'}\right\rangle \ \right|^2$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-m-j(d-1)} \sum_{r=0}^{m} \sum_{l=0}^{2^{j(d-1)}} \sum_{p=0}^{2^m} \frac{1}{2^{r/2}} | \langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle \ |^2 \, 2^{r+j(d-1)} \, \|h\|_\infty^2$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-m/2} \, \|g\|_2^2 \, \|h\|_\infty^2 \, .$$

8.1.2. ***Proof of Proposition*** $2'$ ***- translation of Li's approach using*** $\sigma-$***uniformity.***

Set $\sigma \in (0,1]$ and let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a family of real-valued measurable functions. Also set I(=[0,1]) a bounded interval.

Definition. *A function* $f \in L^2(I)$ *is* $\sigma-$*uniform in* $\mathcal{Q}$ *if*

$$\left| \int_I f(\xi)\, e^{-i\, q(\xi)}\, d\xi \right| \leq \sigma \|f\|_{L^2(I)}$$

for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Lemma 0. *Let* L *be a bounded sub-linear functional from* $L^2(I)$ *to* $\mathbb{C}$, *and* S_σ *be the collection of all functions that are* $\sigma-$*uniform in* $\mathcal{Q}$. *Set*

$$U_\sigma = \sup_{f \in S_\sigma} \frac{|L(f)|}{\|f\|_{L^2(I)}} \quad \& \quad Q = \sup_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} |L(e^{i\, q})| \, .$$

Then for all functions in $L^2(I)$ *we have*

$$|L(f)| \leq \max\{U_\sigma,\, 2\sigma^{-1} Q\} \|f\|_{L^2(I)} \, .$$

Now we remind here that for $j(d-1) > m$ we have that

$$\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} B_{j,m}(f,g)(x) h(x) dx$$

$$= 2^{-\frac{m}{2} - \frac{j(d-1)}{2}} \sum_{l=0}^{2^{j(d-1)}} \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} \langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle \ \mathcal{Q}_{m,p} f(l\, 2^{m-j(d-1)}) \ \langle h,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle$$

$$= 2^{-\frac{m}{2}-\frac{j(d-1)}{2}} \sum_{l=0}^{2^{j(d-1)}} \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} \langle g, \varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle \ \langle f, \psi_{m,l,p}\rangle \ \langle h, \varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle \ ,$$

where

$$\hat{\psi}_{m,l,p}(\xi) := e^{i\, c_d \, \frac{(2^m \xi)^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}{p^{\frac{1}{d-1}}}} \ e^{i\, l\, 2^{m-j(d-1)}\,\xi}\,\phi(\xi)\ .$$

Proposition 3. *For $j(d-1) \geq m$ we have that*

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h)| \lesssim 2^{-\frac{m}{8}} \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2 \|h\|_\infty\ .$$

Set

$$\mathcal{Q} := \{a\xi^{\frac{d}{d-1}} + b\xi \,|\, 2^{m-100} \leq |a| \leq 2^{m+100} \ \& \ b \in \mathbb{R}\}\ .$$

Lemma 1. *Let $\hat{f}\phi \in L^2([0,1])$ be $\sigma-$uniform in $\mathcal{Q}$. Then*

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h)| \lesssim_d \ \sigma\, \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2 \|h\|_\infty\ .$$

Lemma 2. *Let $q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then*

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}((e^{i\check{q}}\phi), g, h)| \lesssim_d 2^{-\frac{m}{4}} \|g\|_2 \|h\|_\infty\ .$$

Notice that applying now Lemma 0 we have

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h)| \leq_d \max\{\sigma, 2\,\sigma^{-1} 2^{-\frac{m}{4}}\} \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2 \|h\|_\infty\ .$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad |\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h)| \leq 2^{-\frac{m}{8}} \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2 \|h\|_\infty\ .$$

Proof of Lemma 1.

We want

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h)| \lesssim \sigma\, \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2 \|h\|_\infty\ ,$$

for all $\hat{f}\phi \in L^2([0,1])$ be $\sigma-$uniform in $\mathcal{Q} \Rightarrow \ |\langle f, \psi_{m,l,p}\rangle| \leq \sigma\, \|f\|_2$.

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}(f,g,h)| \lesssim 2^{-\frac{m}{2}-\frac{j(d-1)}{2}} \sum_{l=0}^{2^{j(d-1)}} \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} |\langle g, \varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle|\,|\langle h, \varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle|\,|\langle f, \psi_{m,l,p}\rangle|$$

$$\leq \sigma\, \|f\|_2\, 2^{-\frac{m}{2}-\frac{j(d-1)}{2}} \{\sum_{l=0}^{2^{j(d-1)}} \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} |\langle g, \varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle|^2\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \{\sum_{l=0}^{2^{j(d-1)}} \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} |\langle h, \varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle|^2\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\leq \sigma\, \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2 \|h\|_\infty\ .$$

Proof of Lemma 2.

For $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ we want

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}((e^{i\check{q}}\phi), g, h)| \lesssim_d 2^{-\frac{m}{4}} \|g\|_2 \|h\|_\infty\ .$$

Set $q(\xi)=a\xi^{\frac{d}{d-1}}+b\xi$ and let $f_0=(e^{i\check{q}}\phi)$. Then:

$$\langle f_0,\psi_{m,l,p}\rangle=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi(\xi)\,e^{i\,c_d\left(a+\left(\frac{2^{md}}{p}\right)^{\frac{1}{d-1}}\right)\xi^{\frac{d}{d-1}}}\,e^{i\,(b+l2^{m-j(d-1)})\xi}\,d\xi\,.$$

Applying now stationary phase principle (or equivalently, using relations (49) and (50)) we deduce

$$|\,\langle f_0,\psi_{m,l,p}\rangle\,|\lesssim_d\frac{1}{(|b+l2^{m-j(d-1)}|+1)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\,.$$

We may consider $b=0$. Take $N\in\mathbb{N}$ to be later specified.

Case 1 $l\leq N2^{j(d-1)-m}$.

$$|\Lambda^1_{j,m}(f_0,g,h)|$$

$$:=2^{-\frac{m}{2}-\frac{j(d-1)}{2}}\sum_{l=0}^{N2^{j(d-1)-m}}\sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}|\,\langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle\,||\,\langle h,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle\,||\,\langle f_0,\psi_{m,l,p}\rangle\,|$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-\frac{m}{2}-\frac{j(d-1)}{2}}\|g\|_2\|h\|_\infty(N2^{j(d-1)})^{\frac{1}{2}}=N^{\frac{1}{2}}2^{-\frac{m}{2}}\|g\|_2\|h\|_\infty\,.$$

Case 2 $l\geq N2^{j(d-1)-m}$.

$$|\Lambda^2_{j,m}(f_0,g,h)|$$

$$:=2^{-\frac{m}{2}-\frac{j(d-1)}{2}}\sum_{l=N2^{j(d-1)-m}}^{2^{j(d-1)}}\sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}|\,\langle g,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle\,||\,\langle h,\varphi_{m,l,p}\rangle\,||\,\langle f_0,\psi_{m,l,p}\rangle\,|$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-\frac{m}{2}-\frac{j(d-1)}{2}}\|g\|_2\|h\|_\infty 2^{\frac{m+j(d-1)}{2}}N^{-\frac{1}{2}}=N^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|g\|_2\|h\|_\infty\,.$$

Combining now cases 1 and 2 we have

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}(f_0,g,h)|\lesssim_d(N^{\frac{1}{2}}2^{-\frac{m}{2}}+N^{-\frac{1}{2}})\,\|g\|_2\|h\|_\infty\,.$$

Choosing now $N=2^{\frac{m}{2}}$ we obtain that

$$|\Lambda_{j,m}(f_0,g,h)|\lesssim_d 2^{-\frac{m}{4}}\,\|g\|_2\|h\|_\infty\,. \tag{51}$$

8.2. **Some aspects concerning Proposition 1.**

In this section we will discuss on two topics referring to the proof of Proposition 1 (see Section 6):

- how can one (at the expense of greater technicalities) still use the discretized version of $B_{j,m}(f,g)$ for the TT^* argument in the regime $2^m\,\gamma'(2^{-j})-$large;
- the necessity of having two different treatments corresponding to the two different regimes in the proof.

We will start our discussion addressing the first topic and we will postpone the discussion of the second one till the very end of our section.

Take for simplicity $j=0$. Then with the discretized version we have that

$$B_{0,m}(f,g)(x)=2^{-m}\sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}\sum_{k=0}^{2^m}\langle g,\varphi_{m,0,p}\rangle\,Q_{m,p}f(k)\,\varphi_{0,k,p2^{-m}}\,.$$

Now when studying the L^2-interaction $\langle B_{0,m}(f,g),B_{0,m}(f,g)\rangle$ first issue is to understand

$$\left\langle\varphi_{0,k,p2^{-m}},\varphi_{0,k',p'2^{-m}}\right\rangle$$

which can be expressed as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}e^{i\,k\,(\xi-2^{-m}p)}\,\hat{\varphi}(\xi-2^{-m}\,p)\,\overline{e^{i\,k'\,(\xi-2^{-m}p')}\,\hat{\varphi}(\xi-2^{-m}\,p')}\,d\xi$$

$$=e^{i(k'\,2^{-m}\,p'-k\,2^{-m}\,p)}\sum_{r,r'\in\mathbb{Z}}a_r\,\overline{a_{r'}}\,e^{-i\,r\,2^{-m}\,p}\,e^{i\,r'\,2^{-m}\,p'}\,\chi(k-k'+r-r')\,,$$

where here $\chi(\cdot)\in S(\mathbb{R})$ (Schwartz function) and $\{a_r\}_r\in l^1(\mathbb{Z})$ are fast decaying complex coefficients.

From last equality we deduce that the main term in the expansion of $\|B_{0,m}(f,g)\|_2^2$ is the diagonal one and that we have fast decay as we move further away from the diagonal $k=k'$. Thus we can write

$$\|B_{0,m}(f,g)\|_2^2\approx 2^{-2m}\sum_{p,p'=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}\sum_{k=0}^{2^m}\langle g,\varphi_{m,0,p}\rangle\,\overline{\langle g,\varphi_{m,0,p'}\rangle}\,e^{-i\,k\,2^{-m}\,p}\,e^{i\,k\,2^{-m}\,p'}$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\hat{f}(\xi)\,\phi(\xi)\,\overline{\hat{f}(\xi_1)}\,\overline{\phi(\xi_1)}\,e^{i(\frac{2^{2m}}{p}\xi^2-\frac{2^{2m}}{p'}\xi_1^2)}\,e^{i\,k(\xi-\xi_1)}\,d\xi\,d\xi_1$$

Now we notice that the oscillatory term is sensitive to variations $\Delta\xi$, $\Delta\xi_1\approx 2^{-m}$ hence we are invited to express $f\sim\sum_{r=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}\langle f,\varphi_{m,0,r}\rangle\,\varphi_{m,0,r}$ and thus investigate the interaction

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\widehat{\varphi_{m,0,r}}(\xi)\,\phi(\xi)\,\overline{\widehat{\varphi_{m,0,r'}}(\xi_1)}\,\overline{\phi(\xi_1)}\,e^{i(\frac{2^{2m}}{p}\xi^2-\frac{2^{2m}}{p'}\xi_1^2)}\,e^{i\,k(\xi-\xi_1)}\,d\xi\,d\xi_1$$

which after calculations gives

$$c\,2^{-m}\,e^{i\frac{r^2}{p}}\,e^{i\frac{kr}{2^m}}\,e^{-i\frac{r'^2}{p'}}\,e^{-i\,\frac{kr'}{2^m}}\,.$$

Thus we are led to the following

(52)

$$\|B_{0,m}(f,g)\|_2^2\approx 2^{-3m}\sum_{p,p'=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}\sum_{r,r'=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}g_p\,\bar{g}_{p'}\,f_r\,\bar{f}_{r'}e^{i\frac{r^2}{p}}\,e^{-i\frac{r'^2}{p'}}\sum_{k=0}^{2^m}e^{i\frac{k(r-p)}{2^m}}\,e^{-i\frac{k(r'-p')}{2^m}}\,,$$

where we set $g_p=\langle g,\varphi_{m,0,p}\rangle$ and $f_r=\langle f,\varphi_{m,0,r}\rangle$.

The main contribution in (52) is given by a term of the form

(53)

$$\mathcal{M}:=2^{-2m}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=0}^{2^{m-1}}\frac{1}{|\alpha-\beta|+1}\Big|\sum_{r=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}\sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}(g_p\,\bar{g}_{p-\alpha})\,(f_r\,\bar{f}_{r-\beta})e^{i\frac{r^2}{p}}\,e^{-i\frac{(r-\beta)^2}{p-\alpha}}\Big|\,.$$

Now using the Van der Corput Lemma (see below) we claim that for any $\alpha,\beta\in[1,2^{m-1}]$ we have

$$\frac{1}{2^m}\Big|\sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}\sum_{r=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}a_p\,b_r\,e^{i\frac{r^2}{p}}\,e^{-i\frac{(r-\beta)^2}{p-\alpha}}\Big|\lesssim\frac{m^{1/4}}{\alpha^{1/6}}\,\|\{a_p\}\|_2\,\|\{b_r\}_r\|_2\,. \tag{54}$$

Suppose for the moment that this is true; setting then $a_p^\alpha:=g_p\,\bar{g}_{p-\alpha}$, $b_r^\beta:=f_r\,\bar{f}_{r-\beta}$, $a^\alpha=\{a_p^\alpha\}_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}$ and $b^\beta=\{b_r^\beta\}_{r=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}$ we have that

(55)

$$\mathcal{M}\lesssim 2^{-m}\sum_{\kappa=0}^{2^{m-1}}\frac{1}{\kappa+1}\sum_{\alpha=0}^{2^{m-1}}\min\left\{\frac{1}{2^m}\,\|a^\alpha\|_1\,\|b^{\alpha+\kappa}\|_1,\ \frac{m^{1/4}}{\alpha^{1/6}+1}\,\|a^\alpha\|_2\,\|b^{\alpha+\kappa}\|_2\right\}.$$

Using a variational argument we further have

$$\mathcal{M}\lesssim 2^{-m}\sum_{\kappa=0}^{2^{m-1}}\frac{1}{\kappa+1}\left\{\frac{1}{2^m}\,(\sum_{\alpha=0}^{\alpha_0}\|a^\alpha\|_1^2)^{\frac12}\,(\sum_{\alpha=0}^{\alpha_0}\|b^{\alpha+\kappa}\|_1^2)^{\frac12}\right\}$$

$$+\,2^{-m}\sum_{\kappa=0}^{2^{m-1}}\frac{1}{\kappa+1}\left\{\frac{m^{1/4}}{{\alpha_0}^{1/6}+1}(\sum_{\alpha=\alpha_0}^{2^{m-1}}\|a^\alpha\|_2^2)^{\frac12}\,(\sum_{\alpha=\alpha_0}^{2^{m-1}}\|b^{\alpha+\kappa}\|_2^2)^{\frac12}\right\}$$

and hence

$$\mathcal{M}\lesssim\frac{m}{2^m}\left\{\frac{\alpha_0}{2^m}+\frac{m^{1/4}}{{\alpha_0}^{1/6}+1}\right\}\,\|f\|_2^2\,\|g\|_2^2\,.$$

Now properly choosing α_0 (*e.g.* $\alpha_0=m^{\frac{3}{14}}\,2^{\frac{6m}{7}}$) we deduce that

$$\mathcal{M}\lesssim m^{\frac{17}{14}}\,2^{-m}\,2^{-\frac{m}{7}}\,,$$

and hence we indeed have

$$\|B_{0,m}(f,g)\|_2\lesssim 2^{-\frac{m}{2}}\,2^{-\frac{m}{16}}\,\|f\|_2\,\|g\|_2\,.$$

Let us return now to our claim; notice that (54) is equivalent with

$$(56)\quad \frac{1}{2^m}\sum_{p,l=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} a_p\,\bar{a}_l\left\{\frac{1}{2^m}\sum_{r=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} e^{i\,(\frac{r^2}{p}-\frac{r^2}{l}-\frac{(r-\beta)^2}{p-\alpha}+\frac{(r-\beta)^2}{l-\alpha})}\right\}\lesssim\frac{m^{1/2}}{\alpha^{1/3}}\,\|\{a_p\}\|_2^2\,.$$

Set now

$$S_{p,l,\alpha,\beta}:=\frac{1}{2^m}\sum_{r=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} e^{i\,(\frac{r^2}{p}-\frac{r^2}{l}-\frac{(r-\beta)^2}{p-\alpha}+\frac{(r-\beta)^2}{l-\alpha})}=:\frac{1}{2^m}\sum_{r=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} v_r\,.$$

Using Van der Corput lemma we have that for any $1\leq H\leq 2^m$ we have

$$|S_{p,l,\alpha,\beta}|=|\frac{1}{2^m}\sum_{r=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} v_r|\lesssim\left(\frac{1}{H}\sum_{h=0}^{H-1}|\frac{1}{2^m}\sum_{r=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} v_{r+h}\,\bar{v}_r|\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}+\frac{H}{2^m}\,.$$

Let

$$V_h:=\frac{1}{2^m}\sum_{r=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} v_{r+h}\,\bar{v}_r\,.$$

Then we have

$$(57)\qquad |V_h|\lesssim\min\left\{\frac{2^{2m}}{h\,\alpha\,|p-l|},\,1\right\}\,.$$

We have now two cases:

- if $H\leq\frac{2^{2m}}{\alpha\,|p-l|}$ then $|S_{p,l,\alpha,\beta}|\lesssim\frac{H}{2^m}\leq\frac{2^m}{\alpha\,|p-l|}$;
- if $2^m\geq H\geq\frac{2^{2m}}{\alpha\,|p-l|}$ then

$$|S_{p,l,\alpha,\beta}|\lesssim\left(\frac{1}{H}\,\frac{2^{2m}}{\alpha\,|p-l|}+\frac{2^{2m}}{\alpha|p-l|}\,\frac{\log H}{H}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}+\frac{H}{2^m}\,,$$

and by properly choosing H we have

$$|S_{p,l,\alpha,\beta}|\lesssim m^{\frac{1}{2}}\,\left(\frac{2^m}{\alpha\,|p-l|}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\,.$$

Thus we conclude that

$$(58)\qquad |S_{p,l,\alpha,\beta}|\lesssim\min\left\{1,\,m^{\frac{1}{2}}\,\left(\frac{2^m}{\alpha\,|p-l|}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\right\}\,,$$

which is enough for proving (56).

For the general case $j<m$ we have that the main term in $\|B_{j,m}\|_2^2$ is given by

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}}:=2^{-3m}\sum_{l=0}^{2^j}\sum_{k=0}^{2^{m-j}}\sum_{p,p'=2^m}^{2^{m+1}}\sum_{r,r'=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} g_p\,\bar{g}_{p'}\,f_r\,\bar{f}_{r'}\,\hat{\varphi}(2^{j-m}(p-p'))$$

$$\times e^{i\frac{r^2}{p}}\,e^{-i\frac{r'^2}{p'}}\,e^{i2^{j-m}\,(p-p')\,k}\,e^{i\,(r-r')\,(l\,2^{-j}+k\,2^{-m})}\,,$$

which for $j < \delta m$ for some $\delta \in (0,1)$ small can be treated in a similar fashion as in the case $j = 0$ and thus making use of the Van der Corput Lemma one obtains the desired $m-$decay.

Reached in this point we understand the natural brake of the arguments appearing in the proof of the Proposition 2: the proof for the regime $2^m \gamma'(2^{-j})$ large is using in the continuous case the Hörmander principle or in the discrete setting presented above the Van der Corput lemma; essentially though, in our problem, both are manifestations of the TT^* argument which comes to solve our task of obtaining decay in the m parameter for the expression $\|B_{j,m}\|_1$ by searching for cancelations in the expression $\|B_{j,m}\|_2$. This method though stops being efficient as $2^m \gamma'(2^{-j})$ approaches 1, and the explanation is coming below:

Taking for simplicity as before the parabola case (hence $\gamma'(t) = t$) we isolate in the main term $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ above only the summand obtained by taking $l = 0$ and $p = p'$:

$$2^{-3m} \sum_{p=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} \sum_{r,r'=2^m}^{2^{m+1}} |g_p|^2 f_r \bar{f}_{r'} e^{i\frac{r^2-r'^2}{p}} \sum_{k=0}^{2^{m-j}} e^{i(r-r')k2^{-m}} .$$

Then as one can easily notice the size of it by taking the supremum restricted to $\|f\|_2 \leq 1$, $\|g\|_2 \leq 1$ is at least 2^{-2m}. Thus the best one can reasonable hope is $\|B_{j,m}\|_2 \sim 2^{-m}$ and hence because $\operatorname{supp} B_{j,m} = [0, 2^{m+j}]$ if is to only use Cauchy-Schwartz we are confined to $\|B_{j,m}\|_1 \lesssim 2^{\frac{j-m}{2}}$ which is efficient for j small but bad as j approaches m.

On the other hand, if we move to the regime $2^m \gamma'(2^{-j})$ small, using duality, our method was focussed on estimating the size of $\|D_{j,m}(g,h)\|_2$. There we've made essentially use of the interaction between highly oscillatory terms but in the end, trough (39) we only used the size of this interaction. This is good enough for our aim if we limit ourselves to the above regime but as soon as we try to use the same argument for the entire case $2^m \gamma'(2^{-j}) > 1$ this approach fails and we are required to use the full force of (8) and make use too of the signum and not only on the size of the output.

These are on briefly the reasons for which one splits the analysis of Proposition 1 in two different regimes.

References

[1] M. Christ, *Hilbert transforms along curves, I: Nilpotent groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **122** (1985), no. 3, 575-596.

[2] M. Christ, *Hilbert transforms along curves, II: A flat case*, Duke Math. J. **52** (1985), no. 4, 887-894.

[3] M. Christ, X. Li, T. Tao, C. Thiele, *On multilinear oscillatory integrals, nonsingular and singular*, Duke Math. J. bf130 (2005), no. 2, 321-351.

[4] M. Christ, A. Nagel, E. Stein, S. Wainger, *Singular and maximal Radon transforms: analysis and geometry*, Ann. of Math. (2) **150** (1999), no. 2, 489-577.

[5] E. B. Fabes, N. M. Rivire, *Singular integrals with mixed homogeneity* Studia Math. **27** (1966), 19-38.

[6] H. Furstenberg, *Nonconventional ergodic averages*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., **50**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (1990), 43–56.

[7] W. T. Gowers, *A new proof of Szemerdi's theorem for arithmetic progressions of length four*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **8** (1998), no. 3, 529-551.

[8] B. Host, B. Kra, *Convergence of polynomial ergodic averages*, Israel J. Math. **149** (2005), 1–19.

[9] B. F. Jones, *A class of singular integrals*, Amer. J. Math. **86** 1964, 441-462.

[10] X. Li, *Uniform estimates for some paraproducts*, New York J. Math. **14** (2008), 145-192.

[11] X. Li, *Bilinear Hilbert transforms along curves I. The monomial case*, arXiv:0805.0107v2.

[12] M. Lacey, C. Thiele, L^p *estimates on the bilinear Hilbert transform for* $2 < p < \infty$, Ann. of Math. (2) **146** (1997), no. 3, 693-724.

[13] M. Lacey, C. Thiele, *On Caldern's conjecture*, Ann. of Math. (2) **149** (1999), no. 2, 475-496.

[14] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.

[15] E. M. Stein, S. Wainger, *Problems in harmonic analysis related to curvature*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **84** (1978), no. 6, 1239-1295.

[16] A. Zygmund, *Trigonometric series*, Cambridge University Press, (1959).

Department of Mathematics, Princeton, NJ 08544-1000 USA
E-mail address: `vlie@math.princeton.edu`